


**REMARKS**

In an Official Action dated March 2, 2006, the Examiner rejected the pending claims, objected to the drawings and the specification. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 1-4 and 21 and favorably consider newly presented claims 22-30.

**Objection to the Drawings**

The Examiner has objected to the drawing in Fig. 2 as improperly showing the chamfer on the flange 55. As previously mentioned, the flange is drawn correctly.

In the following drawing, the outer sleeve is shown separated from the rest of the mounting device and the sectional is taken along a different line so that the sectional view shows the solid portion of the outer sleeve. The line that the Examiner has requested to be removed is shown in the drawing. As can be seen in the following drawing, clearly the line from the chamfer is visible in the figure. Similarly, in Fig. 2, the line would also be visible except that other components are covering the line except for the short line element that the Examiner has requested be removed. Since the lines are proper, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the objection to the drawings.



Objections to Specification

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the objection to the specification. The Examiner has requested that Applicant point out where the specification describes the features of the first and second connectors claimed in claim 1.

Referring to the last paragraph on page 8, extending onto the first paragraph of page 9 of the specification, the application discusses the connection between the nut and the outer sleeve. In the description, the specification provides an example of first and second connectors as being a circumferential flange and an interlocking groove. The specification does not use the terms first and second connectors, however the specification does describe these elements as elements used to connect the nut and the outer sleeve. As previously discussed, there is no need for a verbatim correlation between the claim terms and the terms in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the objection to the specification.

Claim Objections

Although Applicant believes that the claims are clear and definite as required by §112, Applicant has made some of the suggestions requested by the Examiner in order to move prosecution forward. However, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the objection to claim 7. There is no need to include the term axial to describe the slots. The Examiner is equating the slots in claim 7 with the slot recited in claim 1. That may be true in some instances, but it is not necessarily true in every instance. Claim 7 recites elements that are in addition to the slot in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the objection to claim 1.

§102 and §103 Rejections

As previously discussed, the Muellenberg device operates quite differently from Applicants device. Specifically, the Muellenberg device does not have first and second connectors connecting the outer sleeve and the nut. Further, the Muellenberg device is configured to tighten by the nut, but it is not configured to be loosened by the nut. Instead, it requires a number of separate loosening screws that must be separately screwed through the nut and into the outer sleeve to loosen the device. The Examiner states that the nut will inherently loosen by turning it in a second direction, but this is not true. Turning the nut in a first direction pulls the outer sleeve to the left as shown in Fig. 3, to tighten the inner and outer sleeve. The only way to loosen the tightened sleeves is to drive the outer sleeve forwardly (i.e. to the right in the perspective of Fig. 3). However, turning the nut in a second direction does not drive the outer sleeve forwardly because the nut is not configured to drive the outer sleeve forwardly. Instead, the nut would simply thread off the inner sleeve and over the outer sleeve.


Applicant has highlighted this difference in the claim amendments in which claim 1 recites that the first and second connectors substantially impede forward and rearward axial movement of the outer sleeve relative to the nut.

Further, as recited in newly presented claims 22-24, the device is recited to include that the nut and outer sleeve have cooperating left handedly threaded portions. As described in the application, by configuring the device using left handed threads, the device operates to drive the inner sleeve forwardly by using the normal tightening motion, rather than pulling the outer sleeve rearwardly as the known device do. None of the cited references teach or suggest the use of left handed threads, and this change is not simply a matter of design choice, the use of left handed threads provide an advantageous result that is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner favorably consider newly presented claims 22-24, along with claims 25-30.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is in form for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN  
A Professional Corporation  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   
Stephen H. Eland  
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100  
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044